

REMARKS

The Applicants have studied the Office Action dated February 24, 2005 and have made amendments to the independent claims to distinctly claim and particularly point out the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended the dependent claims to reflect the changes to the independent claims. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. By virtue of this amendment, claims 20-37 are pending. Applicants submit that the present response and amendment places the application in condition for allowance or, at least presents the application in better form for appeal. Entry of the present response with amendment is therefore respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph;
- rejected claims 20-21, 24, 26-27, 30, 32-33, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahajan et al. (U.S. 6,226,650 B1);
- rejected claims 22-23, 28-29, and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Mahajan et al. (U.S. 6,226,650 B1) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Background);
- rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahajan et al. (U.S. 6,226,650 B1) and Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Background) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Rackman (U.S. 5,903,646); and
- rejected claims 31 and 37 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahajan et al. (U.S. 6,226,650 B1) in view of Rackman (U.S. 5,903,646).

ARC920010031US1

8

10/044,646

Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 20 has been amended to overcome this rejection. In particular, the present invention, as recited for claim 20, now more clearly recites "predetermined value". Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification as originally filed. See for example, page 12, lines 9-22. No new matter has been added. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome and the rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 20-21, 24, 26-27,30, 32-33, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahajan et al. (U.S. 6,226,650 B1). Independent claims 20, 26, and 32 have been amended to distinguish over Mahajan and the dependent claims 21, 24, 27, 30, 33, and 36 have been amended to reflect the changes to the independent claims. Specifically, Mahajan is silent on:

selecting at least one remote database server;

accessing locally on a first database server, at least one database record in a first database, wherein the database record includes at least one field for each of a sequence number field, a problem identifier field, and a work history field;

searching for at least one database record in the first database, with a value in the work history field matching a predetermined value;

using a sequence value within the sequence number field in the at least one database record in the first database, with the value in the work history field matching the predetermined value as a starting point for synchronization with the remote database server, wherein the sequence value in the sequence number field of the at least one database record is associated with the at least one database record;

sending to the remote database server each database record in the first

database whose associated sequence number in the sequence number field is greater than the sequence value;

appending at least one new database record directly into the first database with a new value in the work history field matching the predetermined value; and

storing a new sequence number directly in a sequence number field of the at least one new database record in the first database, wherein the new sequence number is an increment of a final sequence number of a final database record sent to the remote database.

The Examiner concluded that Mahajan teaches the present invention as recited for claims 20, 26, and 32 and cited several paragraphs in Mahajan in support thereof. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner concluded that Mahajan teaches:

"accessing locally on a first database server, at least one database record, wherein the database record includes at least one field for each of a sequence number field, a problem identifier field, and a work history field"

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claims 20, 26, and 32 to more clearly recite:

"accessing locally on a first database server, at least one database record in a first database, wherein the database record includes at least one field for each of a sequence number field, a problem identifier field, and a work history field"

Support for the above amendment may be found in the Specification as originally filed. See for example, page 6, lines 22-30 to page 7, lines 1-3.

ARC920010031US1

10

10/044,646

No new matter was added.

The Examiner's reliance upon the citations of Mahajan is misplaced for the following reasons: col. 16, lines 23-36 merely discloses modification files. Mahajan teaches that data in the server database is divided into groups. See Mahajan at col. 2, lines 59-64. When the modification files are created by the server, they are associated with one of the particular data groups. See for example, Mahajan at col. 3, lines 1-9. The modification files contain all of the operations on the data set that correspond to the changes to group data to which the transmitting client is assigned.

As taught by Mahajan, the modification files are not even in the database, they reside outside the database on the server. See for example, Mahajan at FIG. 2. The server does not access the database in order to retrieve the modification files. Similarly, the client system does not access the server database to retrieve database records either; the server transmits the modification files (which are not database records) to the client system. The modification files in Mahajan are not database records each with fields containing a single entry per field (sequence number, a problem identifier field, and a work history field) as recited for the independent claims of the present invention. Rather the modification files in Mahajan are not limited to one entry per field. Therefore, Mahajan is not "accessing locally on a first database server, at least one

BEST AVAILABLE COPY